

1963

national statutes, it would practically mean that the application would be to the southern areas of our country, where many of the States have segregation statutes.

That, it seemed to me, was a most persuasive reason, in policy, why we should have a statute of general applicability. Under the commerce clause Congress could write the ticket as to what rights were being created, whereas under the 14th amendment provision of the Constitution the Congress could only give a remedy with respect to rights existing, which is more limited—and very likely, as it depends on some State action, would be of more limited application.

I took a position against a "toothless" public accommodations law, depending solely upon conciliation for enforceability. I did not think that was advisable. I expressed views as to the problem of the "Mrs. Murphy's boarding-house." No State law limits the applicability of the public accommodations statute. I also pointed out that this was a pivotal element of the President's bill and that unless we passed it, with enforcement provisions, it would be very likely that we would satisfy the basic demands against injustice which have brought about the crisis in regard to race relations.

For all of these reasons, Mr. President, I think the testimony may be of interest to my colleagues; and hence I have had it printed in the Record. I am grateful to my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I am pleased to accommodate my colleague, the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Cuba free
CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I judge from the speech made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the comments of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] that neither of those Senators found himself in agreement with my speech the other day on Cuba, but I incorporate that speech by reference at this point, and stand on every word I said the other day.

I respectfully point out that neither of my good friends the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] or the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] came anywhere near to touching upon the points of international law raised in my speech. In order to restate my position on the record, the setting up of an exile government on Guantanamo Bay would not wash out or erase U.S. obligations under the treaty of 1903. That is elementary so far as international law is concerned.

Mr. President, we cannot wash out any obligations under international law by severing all connections with a foreign government and setting up an exile government, and then claiming that the exile government takes over our obligations.

If we were to set up an exile government on Guantanamo Bay it would stand in clear violation of the treaty of 1903.

The language is crystal clear and undeniable. It would not be altered by our recognizing a different government of Cuba, even though that different government might ignore our violation of the treaty. The language makes clear that we entered into the treaty for a naval base and for coaling purposes and for no other purpose.

Our breaking diplomatic relations—which have now been broken—in no way erases our international law obligations to the Cuban Government of Castro, nor his obligations to the United States.

Recognizing an exile government of Cuba would end all relationships between the United States and the Castro government. Our obligation to observe the treaty would remain; but Castro's obligation to observe it would not. So far as he would be concerned, he would have no treaty obligation to respect at all concerning Guantanamo Bay. We, on the other hand, would not only still be bound by it, but we would be violating it if we permit any activity there other than that of a naval and coaling station.

That is why I protested the suggestion the other day and why I repeat today by reference everything I said against the proposal the other day.

I wish now to say a brief word or two on the proposal of my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], which he announced the other day, with respect to a pacific blockade of Cuba against third party ships.

"There hain't no such thing." The moment any country refuses to recognize its pacificity, the moment it is challenged, it is no longer pacific.

The proposal of the Senator from Nebraska was, "We propose merely to freeze out Cuba economically so far as international trade is concerned." I asked the other day, "What makes anybody think Her Majesty's government would recognize such a blockade?"—or the Government of France, or of Canada, or of Italy, or of any other free nation, to say nothing of the Communist nations.

Mr. President, a blockade is no better than its enforceability. When one starts to enforce a blockade one is at war.

I pause for that ugly fact to sink in.

Have we really reached the point where one cannot be a statesman unless he advocates war? Have we reached the point where those of us who seek truly pacific settlements of great issues which threaten the peace of the world are somehow letting down our Government and only those who would wave that flag into tatters are the patriots of our day?

As I said to a group a few weeks ago, "One does not pay respect to the American flag by waving it into tatters."

The question is raised, "What is our policy on Cuba?" It is pretty clear. Our policy on Cuba was established in the act of Punta del Este, and we carried out our obligations under the act of Punta del Este, because we and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere committed ourselves to see to it that Cuba did not follow a course of aggression in the Western Hemisphere. And when the facts became clear last October that

Cuba, a puppet of Khrushchev, had crossed the line of defense into the area of aggression, we proceeded to apply the act of Punta del Este. The President of the United States made it perfectly clear that the ground-to-ground missiles would come out or we would go in, and they came out. After they came out, the aggressive course of conduct on the part of Cuba and Russia ceased to exist. A continuation of any blockade at that time would have been illegal under international law.

I do not propose to support a policy which would make my country an outlaw nation before the other nations of the world. We cannot follow a unilateral course of action and keep ourselves free from the application of the rules of international law.

As I said in my speech the other day, and repeat today, we would lose a unanimous decision in any international tribunal if we sought to enforce a blockade of Cuba against the shipping of all nations, both free and Communist. No Senator on the other side of the aisle hates Castro and the Communist regime he maintains more than does the Senator from Oregon. But in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall continue to do everything I can to urge that my Government stay within the framework of international law.

That is our program toward Cuba. The Organization of American States is working cooperatively with us in enforcing the act of Punta del Este.

There are those who can propose war-making policies if they care to do so, but I am perfectly willing to draw the issue and let the American people decide it. The senior Senator from Oregon will not advocate a blockade of Cuba until Cuba follows a course of action under which that blockade will be legal.

When the President found Cuba in that position last October, a blockade was imposed, and then, for the first time, the free nations of the world rallied around the United States. But when there were those last summer who proposed an illegal blockade, many free nations of the world made it clear to the United States that they would not respect such a blockade.

I will not be drawn into an advocacy of creating an exile government, putting a stamp of "exile" on it, and then proposing that we establish it at Guantanamo Bay, in clear violation of the treaty of 1903. These are only elementary, simple principles of international law that I raise in opposition to the two proposals my friends made in the Senate, and which I answered the other day.

I close my comments by saying that I stand on every word I uttered in my speech the other day. International principles of law are as sound and unanswerable today as they were then, in spite of the fact that my friends from Colorado and Nebraska have commented on that speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

July 9

Mr. HUMPHREY. I rise to commend the Senator from Oregon for his forthright, thoughtful statement on this critical and vital international issue. I fully agree with the Senator's statement, not only as to the undesirability, but the illegality, of the establishment of an exile government at Guantanamo, in light of the terms of the treaty that gives our Government the rights it now has in that area.

I remind my colleagues that the Senator from Oregon was one of the first Members of this body to take issue with the Castro regime when wholesale mass shootings were taking place in Havana and other parts of Cuba. I recall the speeches of the Senator from Oregon when others were toying with the possibility that perhaps Mr. Castro was doing this as a part of a social reform. The Senator from Oregon reminded this body that the violation of international law and the violation of human decency by Castro and his regime in the shooting of one Cuban after another without due process of law, without trial, were full and complete evidence as to the dictatorial and totalitarian tendencies and commitments of Fidel Castro.

So the Senator from Oregon can come with clean hands on this issue. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He has an intimate knowledge of the problems of our relationships in Latin America, particularly in Cuba.

While it may seem to make good headlines to make proposals of an extreme nature relating to Castro, it is the most unbelievably foolish domestic and international policy, in light of the commitments this country has all over the world. We are holding the Soviet Union accountable for violations of international law. We are supporting our case on Berlin on the basis that the Soviet Union has violated international law. Our position on Germany is predicated upon agreements and international law. The day the United States of America casts aside respect for international law and commitments under treaties we shall have no case anywhere in the world.

I cannot conceive of the world's leading power, dedicated to the principles of law and order, dedicated to the principles of orderly change through legal processes, openly violating commitments made in treaties we have signed, in order to accomplish the unlikely possibility of extricating the Cuban people from Castro tyranny.

The Senator is correct in saying that other countries would have no reason to respect any blockade such as has been proposed, and would have no reason to respect any kind of exile government we might establish at our Guantanamo base.

I do not claim to be an expert in this area, but it seems to me there are times when the American people, without any expertise knowledge, ought to recognize that we do not strengthen our hand in international relations by mimicking the Communists. We do not overcome the Communists by aping them. We do not overcome them by following their prac-

tices. What we need more than anything else is not merely a good political and military position, but a solid moral position. When we cast aside the morality of our position, we weaken the entire base of our international policy.

We are indebted to the Senator from Oregon for his courage. I know it would be easier for him to say, "Hurrah, this is a fine proposal." It would encourage the jingo spirit that grips some elements of the country.

The Senator from Oregon is giving sound advice on one of the most sensitive international political questions of our time with reference to our relations in the Caribbean, particularly as they affect Cuba. I thank him. Lest he feel alone in his views, I would like to have the privilege of joining him in the statement he has made today and to say that I welcome his leadership.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his gracious comments. I appreciate them very much.

Mr. McGOVERN subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. Let me say that a few moments ago, when I was presiding over the Senate, there developed debate, led by the senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), in which issue was taken with the remarks made earlier in the Senate by the senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORSE), the very able chairman of the Latin American Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, and remarks which the junior Senator from South Dakota had made on the floor of the Senate at an earlier time.

I should like to associate my own position very strongly with the policy set forth here today by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORSE) and the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY). The views which they expressed are not only realistic, but they hold fast to the ideals that have guided our country throughout our history and have brought us to a position in the world in which we hold the respect of all those countries that believe in peace and freedom.

I would not want the Record to imply, as I think it might from some of the remarks that were made earlier today by the Senator from Colorado, that I take a view on Cuba that would minimize the importance of the Castro regime and referring to the attitude that some among us take toward Cuba as an obsession. I was not thereby implying there is nothing to worry about with reference to Cuba. But a military commander or a military strategist who keeps his eye fastened on only one flank and ignores the dangers from the other flank, the center of the line or from the rear is not a good one. That was the tenor of remarks which I made earlier on the floor of the Senate. I suggested that some of us have become so involved and so obsessed with our fears and anxieties

about Castro that we lose sight of some of the more fundamental threats to the security of our country and the hemisphere.

Someone has said that Castro is not a dagger aimed at our heart, but is rather a bone in the throat. It is not very comfortable to have a bone in the throat. We ought to do what we can to remove it. But I would stop short of a recommendation that we cut off our heads in order to dispose of the irritant in our throats. The policy which the present administration is following, which has the support of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORSE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), as expressed here today, is one which deals with that irritant and threat and places it in proper perspective. It is not a policy of putting our heads in the sand, as was implied earlier today. It is a policy that has been based upon very positive and direct action on the part of our Government to keep Mr. Castro and his regime under constant surveillance. We have daily overflights that are giving us an accurate picture of what is going on in the hills of Cuba. We have applied economic sanctions. We have attempted diplomatically to isolate Castro. But we have done those things within the traditions of international law and in due respect to our commitments to the other members of the Organization of American States.

Because we have followed these intelligent, limited objectives, we have had the support of our allies, not only in Latin America but also in Western Europe and throughout the free world.

In conclusion, I desire to say that one of the statements which was made here today that disturbs me perhaps most of all was the statement by the senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) in which he took exception to what he called our wonderful coexistence policy. He said he was using the phrase "wonderful coexistence" in a sarcastic vein, leaving the clear implication that those of us who believe in coexistence are somehow betraying the best interests of the country.

It seems to me that the alternative to coexistence is coextinction. It was former President Eisenhower who several years ago said that there is no longer any reasonable alternative to peace. We can follow a policy of strength, right, and justice, and still follow a policy based upon our desire to exist even in a world in which there are many people whose ideology we abhor and with which we disagree.

It seems to me that the great dagger which is aimed at our heart is the danger of a nuclear exchange—a nuclear exchange which would leave no real victor, but would result in a devastation that is almost unspeakable.

So while keeping our defenses strong, keeping our international commitments, and following, as we have in the past, the guidelines of international law, I would hope that our country would resist the temptation to an extreme and reckless policy.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] for the second brilliant and eloquent statement that he has made on the U.S. Cuban policy. The speech that he made the other day stands unanswered. The major premises that he just laid down before the Senate cannot be answered. I am proud to be associated with him in support of and in defense of President Kennedy's program in connection with Cuba and his great statesmanship in carrying out the Act of Punta del Este on which much of our Cuban policy is based.

The Senator from South Dakota referred to the economic containment of Cuba. Many people apparently are unaware of the fact that there has been a great loss of economic strength in Cuba, and because of the very policies of surveillance that the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out.

Mr. President, I would have the RECORD show that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has been greatly strengthened because of the membership of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on that committee for many years. His eloquent voice and brilliant mind have been brought to bear upon one foreign relations issue after another for many years.

To have him on my side on this issue is all the support I feel I need to satisfy myself that I am right. I appreciate his remarks very much.

FOREIGN AID—AID TO PAKISTAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several newspaper stories of recent days have surely brought home to the American people some of the follies to be perpetuated in the foreign aid bill submitted to Congress.

The first appeared in the Washington Post of June 30. It is by Warren Unna and is headlined: "Red China-Pakistan Flight Pact Stirs United States."

It describes a civil aviation pact agreed to by the Governments of Pakistan and Red China, giving Pakistani planes the right to land at Canton and Shanghai in China. These stops would apparently be added to the regular schedule of Pakistan International Airlines between Karachi and Tokyo. Thus, Chinese citizens will have full travel rights in and out of China via Pakistan and Japan.

Moreover, the pact carries, according to this story, the reciprocal right of the Chinese to land their airliners in the Pakistani cities of Karachi in west Pakistan and Dacca in east Pakistan.

Mr. Unna quotes one U.S. official as saying, "This will give China a springboard not only to Asia, but to Africa, where they really have set their sights."

It will probably require that spare parts for the passenger jets flown by the Pakistani airlines to be kept on hand in these Chinese cities, contrary to U.S. statutes forbidding U.S. aid to countries which ship strategic materials to Communist countries. It will also bring about the flyover of Chinese planes over India, as they cross from Dacca to Karachi.

I ask unanimous consent to have the

full text of this story printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1963]

RED CHINA-PAKISTAN FLIGHT PACT STIRS UNITED STATES

(By Warren Unna)

Pakistan has just initiated a civil aviation agreement with Communist China that will give China its first air outlet to the non-Communist world.

"We look upon this as an unfortunate breach of free world solidarity and take a dim view of it," a State Department official declared. This will just give China a springboard, not only to Asia, but to Africa, where they really have set their sights."

The Chinese-Pakistani agreement, announced in Karachi by Air Commodore M. Nur Khan, the managing director of Pakistan International Airlines (PIA), would permit PIA to make stops in both Canton and Shanghai on its regularly scheduled route from Karachi and Dacca to Tokyo.

In addition to permitting Chinese to fly to the non-Communist world in PIA planes, the agreement grants the Chinese Civil Aviation Authority the reciprocal right to fly its planes to Dacca and Karachi.

The agreement is considered to have several serious international implications in addition to the open door outlet to the non-Communist world which the State Department fears. These are:

If PIA's American-built 720B passenger jets make turn-arounds within China requiring that spare parts be on hand, American officials foresee the possibility of a cut-off of U.S. aid to Pakistan. The Battle Act forbids aid to countries which ship strategic materials to Communist countries.

Japan, which consistently has turned down Communist China's requests for a similar civil aviation agreement, now finds itself in the embarrassing position of being linked to China anyway, via PIA. Japanese Embassy officials here pointed out that—aside from the serious political considerations—Japan is likely to have considerable hesitation over permitting a rival route that would cut into Japan Air Lines' own passenger business taking mainland China-bound passengers as far as Hong Kong.

India, still bristling from last fall's border invasion by Communist China, hardly could be expected to welcome the overflight of Chinese planes as they cross India's midriff from Dacca, in east Pakistan, to Karachi, in west Pakistan.

ALREADY EXPRESSED

U.S. concern has already been expressed to the Pakistani Government in Karachi. Pakistani officials have responded that the air agreement is a purely economic proposition.

Aviation Daily, in first reporting the agreement, declared that the Chinese presumably had two objectives in mind:

(1) To become independent of the Soviet Union in both airplanes and air services (the Chinese are expected to take delivery of some British Viscounts this year).

(2) To provide direct outlets "to a world from which they have been largely separated."

Nur Khan, in returning from Peking, declared: "PIA will be the first international carrier to operate through Canton and Shanghai and PIA is appreciative of this concession. The discussions between PIA and the Chinese civil aviation authorities were held in a frank and cordial atmosphere."

EXPECTED TO VISIT

Now a Chinese delegation is expected to visit Karachi to complete technical details and currency arrangements.

The civil aviation agreement follows the conclusion of a Pakistan-Communist China trade agreement signed in January and a settlement of the Pakistan-China border, signed in March.

U.S. officials are convinced that Pakistan's warmup toward Communist China is part of an attempt to thwart the increasingly closer ties between the United States and Pakistan's border enemy, India.

Pakistan is a longtime recipient of both U.S. military and economic aid. During his trip to the United States in July, 1961, Pakistan President Mohammed Ayub Khan told a joint session of Congress: "If there is real trouble in Asia, there is no other country where you will be able to every put your foot in. The only people who will stand by you are the people of Pakistan."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take no exception to the right of Pakistan to enter into this agreement. But it is evidence, if any more evidence is needed, of the futility of large-scale American aid to nations that we think are going to protect our interests vis-a-vis either Russia or China.

There are few nations in the world that have received more military and economic grant aid in recent years than has Pakistan. It has been sent on the theory that Pakistan was a bulwark and an ally against the expansionism of Communist China. Exclusive of military aid, Pakistan has received over \$2 billion from us, of which more than \$1.2 billion has been under the foreign aid bill. It is not possible to say how much military aid she has received because that is one of the four countries in the world for which we still keep secret military aid in years past.

But the size of the U.S. military group we have there administering it makes it clear that Pakistan is the beneficiary of one of the larger U.S. military aid programs.

This morning, in the Committee on Foreign Relations, we were talking about foreign aid, including military aid, to another country in this section of the world which I seriously doubt ought to be receiving any today. Be that as it may the question arose as to how much money we are spending, over and above the military assistance program and aid program, in maintaining a large number of American troops in that country. We were told that information was top secret, as is country-by-country aid for the fiscal year covered by the current bill.

So long as it is top secret, my lips are sealed. However, I say again to the administration, as I have said to previous administrations during my years of service in the Senate, that I see no reason why such information should be top secret. I have seen no military justification for making it top secret. The administration has the power to make it top secret; but I do not believe in keeping from the American people a single fact belonging to the American people in the absence of a clear showing that a disclosure of such fact might be detrimental to the security of this country.

The question of foreign aid is a question that should go to the jury box. The jury consists of all the taxpayers of the United States. They cannot pass upon the evidence unless they have the evidence. The evidence is being denied them.

The American people ought to know what the total expenditure of the American taxpayers in Pakistan has been in years past, and what is programmed for fiscal 1964. The evidence made available to them falls millions of dollars short of the true amount. I hope that my administration will proceed to accept this fact on the same basis as any other fact, which, except from the standpoint of the security of the Republic, ought to be made known to the taxpayers.

As the Senate has heard me say for many years, the substantive rights of the American people depend upon their procedural rights. Denying the American people the facts involves a bad precedent. We have not reached that point. However, if we continue the policy of denying to the American people one fact after another, we will be adopting police state tactics. It only becomes a matter of degree; and it is difficult to draw a line between a police state policy and a policy of a free nation that is denying only such facts as the security of the country dictates should be denied.

On this point I think we ought to lift the barrier, and the American people ought to know the total amount of taxpayer dollars that is going and has been going into Pakistan. The same thing is true of South Vietnam, which is the other country to which I referred a moment ago.

The American people ought to be told of every dollar of American expenditures in South Vietnam, including the cost of maintaining American troops in South Vietnam. As I have said so many times, these are American troops. We look in vain to find any substantial number of troops in South Vietnam from any other free nation of the world. The American taxpayers are paying the bill. One might think that freedom is precious only to the United States, not to Australia, New Zealand, Canada, England, France, Italy, or any other NATO ally.

For many years, Pakistan also received supporting assistance, which is grant aid to her budget to maintain her large military expenditures. It totaled over \$79 million. Grants for her economic development have also been large, totaling \$211.5 million through fiscal 1962.

Every year, this large aid program for Pakistan has been justified on the ground of her stalwart opposition to Communist expansion.

I hope we have been disabused of that illusion once and for all. Far from standing as a bulwark, it is Pakistan that is now opening the door for Red Chinese expansionism. What is more, she has proceeded with an agreement that we had prevailed upon the Japanese not to make, thus incurring the displeasure of Japan at seeing the business go elsewhere.

Pakistan has already signed a trade agreement with Red China, again getting us into trouble with Japan for having prevailed on them not to do the same thing.

I want to make it clear that I think Pakistan has every right to conduct her own affairs with Red China as she sees fit. But she certainly does not have any right to go on receiving bountiful Ameri-

can aid. She has shown that her actions disqualify her for any more of what we call strategic assistance, which is grant military and economic aid.

I have no objection to development loans to Pakistan. They have been useful to her people, and hence useful to us, provided they are repaid in full. But all foundation for so-called strategic assistance to Pakistan has disappeared, and ought to be eliminated from the foreign aid bill for fiscal 1964.

I intend to give my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations, both at the committee level and in the Senate, an opportunity to vote for drastic cuts in military and economic aid to Pakistan. If Senators wish to know what the present attitude of Pakistan is, they should read the Washington Post article of this morning, under the headline "Pakistan Warns West of Arms Aid to India." The President of Pakistan said yesterday, at Rawalpindi:

Smaller Asian nations will be driven to seek the protection of Communist China if the western arms buildup of India continues.

Not only does Pakistan expect to receive a large amount of military aid herself; but apparently the President of Pakistan wants to use interesting, coercive methods to tell us whom we may aid. The article continues:

Ayub told a political meeting the West was in fact contributing to the spread of communism in Asia by forcing nations who feared a strong India into Chinese arms.

The Pakistani leader included Russia with the western nations arming India "to achieve their own objectives."

He claims the United States and Britain were "overoptimistic" in hoping smaller Asian nations would gather round India after its military strength was built up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 1963]
PAKISTAN WARNS WEST OF ARMS AID TO INDIA

RAWALPINDI, PAKISTAN, July 8.—President Mohammed Ayub Khan said here today smaller Asian nations will be driven to seek the protection of Communist China if the Western arms buildup of India continues.

Ayub told a political meeting the West was in fact contributing to the spread of communism in Asia by forcing nations who feared a strong India into Chinese arms.

The Pakistani leader included Russia with the Western nations arming India to achieve their own objectives.

He claimed the United States and Britain were overoptimistic in hoping smaller Asian nations would gather round India after its military strength was built up.

Ayub said India had overwhelmed smaller countries including Kashmir in the past.

He added these nations rather than being attracted by the new Indian strength would have to seek protection—which would only be available from China.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the foreign aid bill provides \$4,500 million. Every once in a while someone asks, "Where would you cut?"

In these daily speeches—and they will continue until the foreign aid bill is finally disposed of, unless I happen to be out of the city at the time, or indis-

posed, or am unable for some other reason to speak—I shall continue to answer the question: "Where would the senior Senator from Oregon cut the foreign aid bill?"

My answer today is that we should cut substantially the amount of money provided in the bill for Pakistan. I am not entirely certain what sums of aid we should extend to India, but I am satisfied that our program for Pakistan can and should be reduced to a small fraction of what it has been averaging in the last 8 or 10 years.

RELATED SITUATION IN TAIWAN

The second newspaper story I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate was published in the Washington Evening Star of July 1. It is written by Wendell Merick, and is headlined: "Chiang's Army Is Seen Losing Desire To Invade."

The burden of this story is that even the army of Chiang Kai-Shek on Taiwan has begun to accept the fact that it is never going to invade the Chinese mainland. Almost everyone else in the world has known that for many years, but apparently it is finally becoming clear to the exiled Chinese, as well.

Mr. Merick tells us that almost half of Chiang's army is now native Formosan, and that they will comprise 60 to 65 percent of that army within a few years. The Formosans have far less interest in invading the mainland.

But the significant item I wish to point out is the oversized officer corps of Chinese generals we are supporting by our heavy military aid.

We are sending military aid to support an army, supposedly of 380,000 troops, in Formosa. But there are only 329,650 there. For these 330,000, the Chinese have 900 generals, which is more than the United States has in its Army of more than a million.

It is no wonder that it costs American taxpayers a lot of money, when we have that many general officers in Taiwan to keep in the style to which they are accustomed.

We hear much these days about featherbedding. I say that good naturedly but pointedly. If anyone can beat the military for featherbedding, he is going some. This is an interesting example of featherbedding by way of surplus generals in the Formosan army, paid for by the American taxpayers.

What is my answer to the question, Where would the senior Senator from Oregon cut? I would cut drastically the amount of military aid provided in the bill for Taiwan.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Evening Star article of July 1, 1963, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 1, 1963]

CHIANG'S ARMY IS SEEN LOSING DESIRE TO INVAD

(By Wendell S. Merick)

TAIPEI, July 1.—The Nationalist China Army is running short of men who really care about returning to the mainland.

The harsh facts about Chiang Kai-shek's army are contained in a survey U.S. advisers

1963

Following the Embassy's receipt from the Department of State of the allocation of the various types of grants for a given year—i.e. foreign leader, foreign specialist—the committee arranges a priority list of candidates for the predetermined fields. A principal and alternate candidate is selected for each grant to be awarded. The cultural affairs section of the Embassy then forwards these recommendations to Washington, D.C., which retains the prerogative of final selection. If the recommendations are approved, the actual grant is then sent to the Embassy for processing.

The broad scope of the exchange program is evidenced by the inclusion of an adjunct to the leader and specialist programs, known as facilitative assistance. This program is available to persons with foreign leader or foreign specialist qualifications. There is no grant of funds accompanying facilitative assistance, rather it is a service provided for these persons while they are in the United States under their own auspices. Upon request from the Embassy, the Department of State will arrange for professional contacts in the person's interest area. Voluntary organizations and interested individuals then will be asked to assist outstanding political, cultural, informational, educational, and other leaders in arranging itineraries and in making contacts with individuals and organizations in the United States in their particular fields of interest.

In addition to inviting Filipinos to the United States, or facilitating their private visits, the exchange program also provides annually for a select group of American specialists to come to the Philippines. These are persons who represent a wide variety of academic, professional, and cultural fields. Their visits can include such activities as—

1. Undertaking specific assignments at the request of local groups and institutions to advise or work with them on their organization, or programs or techniques in specific fields, such as youth leadership, government affairs, radio, labor, higher education, community development, journalism, athletics.
2. Giving lectures or conducting workshops, seminars or clinics in fields such as American literature, poetry, history, the theater, architecture, sculpture, painting, music, athletic activities, economics and related interest areas.

These activities are arranged in conjunction with local sponsors who have expressed an interest in having an American specialist in these fields. These cooperative plans result in a visit by a full-time American specialist who comes to the Philippines for a period of approximately 2 months, or by a regional pool specialist, who may be here for a few days of a few weeks.

In any case, the American specialist is selected by the Department of State, either as the result of a request from field posts or on grants initiated by the Department and concurred in by the Embassy. The Embassy must receive an indication from local interests that an American specialist would be welcome before the person is invited to come to the Philippines.

Because of the vast import of the cultural area of international relations, there are privately sponsored opportunities under the exchange visitor visa program in addition to U.S. Government supported exchange programs. In addition, private foundations also offer opportunities in a variety of fields.

As international problems become increasingly complex, it is more essential than ever that the peoples of one nation understand the life, attitudes, and values of the peoples of their fellow nations. An educational and cultural exchange program appears to be a major means of achieving this understanding.

The U.S. exchange program represents one nation's belief in the worth of cultural diplomacy. The combined energies of the American Government, American private enter-

prise, and individual American citizens are striving to create through cultural diplomacy an ever-increasing worldwide level of understanding and friendship.

Mutual of New York To Build 30-Story Office Building in Syracuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gave me a great deal of pleasure this week to read in the Syracuse Post-Standard that Mutual of New York will build a 30-story office building in our city. Part of the building will be used by MONY for a data processing center.

This action, by the Nation's oldest insurance company, will be mutually beneficial, I am sure. Some 650 to 800 new jobs will be created in downtown Syracuse.

I think this building will be a tribute to a growing, dynamic city and to the long range careful planning of MONY.

I am pleased to share this marvelous story of achievement with my colleagues. Following is an editorial from the Post-Standard:

GREAT DAY FOR SYRACUSE, MONY PLAZA FULFILLS DREAMS

History was made for Syracuse in 1937 when it was announced that Carrier Corp. would establish its principal manufacturing facility and home office here.

History was made for Syracuse in 1942 when it was announced that General Electric would build its great Electronics Park here, to become within a few years the largest industrial employer in this area.

Equally important history was made for Syracuse yesterday when it was disclosed that Mutual of New York, the Nation's oldest, ninth largest, and one of the best known life insurance companies, would erect a 30-story office building directly east of Hotel Syracuse and would create from 650 to 800 new jobs in downtown Syracuse.

With all its important ramifications and urban renewal commitments by the city, the MONY Plaza development may well prove to be the most important bonanza of the three, as far as rejuvenation of the downtown core area of the city is concerned.

Redevelopment of the entire 4-acre square block bounded by South Warren, Harrison, Montgomery, and Madison Streets, as described in detail in our news columns today, will be a tremendous "shot in the arm" for all Syracuse, but particularly for the south end of the main business area.

SIGNED AND SEALED

This is not just another announcement of plans for a "paper building," which so many promoters have sketched and scuttled in the past 20 years. This is a real "signed, sealed, and delivered" real estate deal of the first magnitude, with the directors of MONY already having agreed to erect the 30-story MONY Tower with company funds.

MONY will be the principal user of the whole project, occupying at first about one-third of the 370,000-square-foot, 30-story tower, for its data processing center, which will move to Syracuse from New York City. A 10-story motor hotel will be built at once immediately adjacent on the Madison Street side of the block, and space will be provided for an eventual twin tower at the Montgomery-Madison corner.

CITY BUILDS ALSO

Under terms of an agreement made by Mayor Walsh for the city 18 months ago, the city of Syracuse will construct a 700-car garage on the south side of the square block, along Harrison Street.

The city will apply for Urban Renewal Federal and State approval of redevelopment of the entire southern half of the block, and will receive credit for the cost of the garage toward its one-sixth share of the total cost of redevelopment. Thus the garage can be acquired without adding to city indebtedness beyond the commitment for one-sixth of the urban renewal expense.

With the present parking lots between Hotel Syracuse and the War Memorial already accommodating some 600 cars, there will be an immediate market for all the space in the new garage, and it is expected that the stimulated business in the area will also fill the so-called Strand garage, owned by the city a block west.

A 36-foot-wide covered mall, or galleria, will connect Hotel Syracuse and the War Memorial, heated in winter and air conditioned in summer, with small shops and other facilities, according to present plans.

This will be connected to the hotel and to the memorial by either overhead or underground passageways, enabling hotel guests to walk directly to the convention hall without going out of doors.

Thus will be developed one of the most striking and beautiful downtown blocks in the entire Nation, to be built as one unit, with uniform design and featuring the tallest building in the State outside of metropolitan New York.

It will be in direct line with the new community plaza, already under construction, the New York State Medical Center, and the revamped Syracuse University campus area for which \$76 million is now being raised.

This exciting and imaginative scheme will make Syracuse truly outstanding among cities of its size and will greatly stimulate business of all kinds in this area.

REALTOR IS MOVING FORCE

Eagan Real Estate is the moving force behind this latest redevelopment plan, and we agree with Mayor Walsh that Leo T. Eagan and his associates deserve full credit for a magnificent achievement.

This is indeed a prime example of a community pulling itself up by its own bootstraps.

Here private initiative, private capital, private enterprise and confident salesmanship cooperated 100 percent with government at all levels to achieve a superb result which will benefit every Syracusan.

The boost in employment, the increase in retail trade, the gain in the tax rolls, the superior facilities, all these and many more benefits will flow from this historic undertaking.

Syracuse welcomes MONY as one of its principal citizens, and we thank the Eagans and the city administration for all they have done to hasten this day.

Cuba Free
Resolution Would Freeze All Cuban Government Assets on Deposit in All OAS Member Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent actions by the U.S. Gov-

ernment to freeze Cuban funds on deposit in U.S. financial institutions comes as good news. It is the first new step this Government has taken against Communist Cuba for some weeks now, and while the amount of funds affected will not topple the Castro economy, it is an act which places the United States in a position of leading the rest of the free nations of this hemisphere to follow suit.

I have proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 146 that the United States offer a five-point plan of action to the Organization of American States for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere. The plan includes the freezing of all Cuban Government assets now on deposit in the financial institutions of all OAS member nations, which of course includes the United States.

Now that the United States has complied with this portion of the recommendations, I am hopeful that the U.S. Government will now press this new example upon the other nations of this hemisphere to follow suit for the isolation of Communist Cuba.

Foreign Assistance for the United Arab Republic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before this House a foreign assistance bill containing funds for the United Arab Republic. I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the latest report on the shocking use of poison gas by the military forces of Egypt, the nation that American taxpayers are asked to support. In his reported brutal use of poison gas against the civilians of Yemen, United Arab Republic President Nasser has emulated the tactics of Mussolini against the Ethiopians in the 1930's.

I do not feel that the American taxpayer should subsidize the United Arab Republic by a single cent, in view of its brutal and aggressive policies. The authoritative British report, conveyed by the Associated Press, describes the poison gas bombs used by the United Arab Republic against Yemeni(s) civilians and states that—

Since the Russian bloc supplies all military equipment for Egypt, it is likely that the bomb was manufactured in Russia or Czechoslovakia.

There is pending before the Congress an amendment to the foreign assistance bill offered by myself, identical with one offered by Senator KEATING in the Senate, and supported by many Members of both bodies. This amendment would sever American assistance to the United Arab Republic if that country, or any other, diverted its own resources to purchase Communist poison gas bombs as Nasser has already done.

I fervently appeal for the approval of this amendment.

EGYPTIANS' USE OF GAS IN YEMEN WAR CLAIMED

LONDON, July 8.—British newspaper correspondent charged today that Egyptian forces in Yemen are using poison gas against remote mountain villages still loyal to the royalist cause.

Richard Beeston of the London Daily Telegraph asserted that seven died in the northern Yemeni village of Al Kawma from a gas attack and 25 others—gravely disfigured—faced a lingering death.

"President Nasser can now claim the distinction of being the first person to employ chemical warfare since Mussolini used mustard gas on Ethiopian tribesmen during the 1930s," said Mr. Beeston in an account of a 3-day trek by donkey and on foot to Al Kawma from Saudi Arabia.

HEARD CEASELESS COUGHING

Mr. Beeston charged that Egyptian aircraft deployed in the Yemeni civil war dropped a gas bomb on Al Kawma early last month.

"I approached the village late at night. From more than 100 yards away, I could hear the coughing of the gassed villagers which went on ceaselessly.

"In the morning, villagers crowded me, pleading with me to send medicines and doctors to cure their coughs and blisters. The face of one woman had turned a vivid yellow.

"Another woman was blinded by rubbing her eyes with contaminated fingers. One of the worst affected villagers I saw, Mohammed Nasser, 12, who had a perpetual cough and deep, open wounds on his body, the size of a half crown (about the size of a 50-cent piece) from gas blisters."

The British newsmen said he was shown the remains of what villagers claimed had been the gas bomb.

"It was obviously a complicated piece of machinery, probably beyond the engineering capabilities of the Egyptians. Since the Russian bloc supplies all military equipment for Egypt, it is likely that the bomb was manufactured in Russia or Czechoslovakia," Mr. Beeston deduced.

The correspondent said medical supplies had been sent to the villagers from the royalist headquarters of the Iman (king) Mohammed Al-Badr—but they consisted of little more than iodine and aspirin.

"There is little doubt that there have been at least three or four other poison gas attacks during the past month," Mr. Beeston reported. "In my journey to Al Kawma, Egyptian Ilyushin bombers were constantly over, bombing and strafing the surrounding villages."

Catholic War Veterans Commend Peter Rodino III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, much national attention and approval has been directed toward the little-people-to-little-people program initiated by Peter W. Rodino III, son of our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR.

The most recent recognition of young Peter's efforts at fostering international understanding and cooperation came on June 23 when the National Board of Officers of the Catholic War Veterans, at its quarterly meeting held in New York

City, adopted a resolution commending young Peter Rodino and urging all young people to participate in the program.

The resolution was submitted by Attorney Crescenzi W. Castaldo, national judge advocate of the Catholic War Veterans, on behalf of the New Jersey State Department which had adopted the resolution at its June 7 convention.

I commend the attention of my colleagues to this citation of Peter Rodino III and his little-people-to-little-people program:

Whereas Peter W. Rodino III, of Newark, the son of PETER W. RODINO, JR., a Member of Congress from the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, has displayed unusual and inspirational interest in the cause of world peace and international goodwill; and

Whereas this distinguished young American has conceived and created a program among all children of the world to promote peace among nations; and

Whereas the formation of the nongovernmental little-people-to-little-people program is designed to promote greater understanding and harmony among all nations through the voices of children who speak with utmost sincerity in this great cause: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans, Department of New Jersey, in convention assembled this 7th day of June 1963, urge all our citizens, especially our young people, to participate in this program in order that world peace and international goodwill may be attained; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the National Department of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America for its consideration and approval.

National Anthem Day in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the Free State of Maryland, has proclaimed September 14, the anniversary of "The Star-Spangled Banner," as National Anthem Day in Maryland. It would be most appropriate if all Americans were to pause in observance of a day commemorating the national anthem. Music has long been a part of the American tradition. "The Star-Spangled Banner" epitomizes in music the indomitable will of the American people and deserves a place of reverence in the lives of all Americans. I call this National Anthem Day proclamation to the attention of the Congress so that we might consider making the commemoration of the birth date of "The Star-Spangled Banner" truly national in observance:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND—EXECUTIVE
DEPARTMENT

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION—NATIONAL ANTHEM
DAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1963

Whereas, on the 14th day of September, in the year 1814, Francis Scott Key, after a night of vigil while detained by the British invaders planning the capture of Baltimore, saw "by the dawn's early light" that our flag was still waving over the ramparts of Fort McHenry, and was then inspired to write his song of victory, "The Star-Spangled Banner"; and

1963

vicious and blasphemous. Goodby, Lord's Prayer. Goodby, Bible.

This is one and only one man's opinion, but it is very unfortunate (so far as I am concerned) that this complaint had to be made by an atheist. Of course, I believe if there are atheists, that they have a right to their own opinion even if I think they are wrong, but being of a small minority group, and knowing that our Nation was not founded and nourished by atheists, it is indeed regrettable that people who do not even believe in a Supreme Being have been so deeply involved in seeking to overthrow that which is so meaningful and helpful to so many who do believe in a Supreme Being. I should hate very much to exchange places with them in the day of judgment as they appear before the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Universe—before a God in whom they do not believe. This, I say, as kindly as I know how.

It is also very strange to me that anything so good and beautiful as the use of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of the Holy Bible, which has been practiced so long (187 years or longer) and approved by 39 different States, should have taken so long to be declared unconstitutional. If it is a violation of the Constitution to do these things, how did 39 States and so many other people not see it long ago? We all must know that early education in America was almost exclusively Christian. The early American colonists came to these shores by the love of God and zeal for godly worship. They built their educational structure upon a religious basis. This was not only true of early independent colleges but also of the public schools. The church was the parent and sponsor of education. Religion was the keystone of the educational arch. The role of religion in education of their children mirrored the importance parents professed to give it in their own lives. The first textbook in the early colonial schools did more to build character and mold religious thought than any other, except the Bible, and was often referred to as "The Little Bible of New England." The exact date of its origin is unknown but it was advertised in the Boston Almanac in 1691. It contained the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, a few psalms, and simple Christian instruction. It was used for over 100 years by parents and schoolmasters and was a part of the foundation of our Nation. The alphabet appeared near the front with an appropriate picture by each letter and a brief statement. "A" stood for Adam and there was a picture of the Garden of Eden with the words, "In Adam's fall we all sinned." "B" stood for the Bible Mind. "C" for the Crucifixion and there was a picture of it with the words, "Christ crucified for sinners died." As beautiful as that was, alas, that method of teaching disappeared long, long ago. In fact, this beautiful religious situation out of which our Nation grew has almost been reversed. Something has happened to education. God has been banished as a consciously recognized factor in much of our educational philosophy today and religion has become a peripheral adjunct, if that.

Dr. Edward B. Pusey¹ has well said, "All things must speak of God, refer to God, or they are atheistic. History, without God, is chaos without design or end or aim. Political economy, without God, would be a selfish teaching about the acquisition of wealth, making the larger portion of mankind animate machines for its production; physics, without God, would be a dull inquiry into certain meaningless phenomena; ethics, without God, would be a varying rule without principle, or substance, or center, or ruling hand; metaphysics, without God, would

make man his own temporary god, to be resolved, after his brief hour here, into the nothingness out of which he proceeded. All sciences . . . will tend to exclude the thought of God if they are not cultivated with reference to Him. History will become an account of man's passion and brute strength, instead of the ordering of God's providence for His creatures' good; physics will materialize man, and metaphysics God."

We have gone a long ways from the ideals of our Founding Fathers. How is it possible that we have been wrong for so long? It took hundreds of years for us to discover our beautiful mistake.

This ruling of the Supreme Court in the very strictest sense calls for absolute separation of church and State, and it appears in this case that it is separation of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of the Bible from the States' schools. While both of these are thought of in connection with the church, they are often used apart from the church. This is literal separation without allowance or exception for that which is revered and approved no doubt by the majority of the people of the United States.

As we have learned from other U.S. Supreme Court decisions, it is clear that our only recourse, should we desire one, is in offering an amendment to the Constitution which would permit the use of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of the Bible in public schools. This, I believe, would be ratified by a majority of States and people. The Constitution, like our Declaration of Independence, is an immortal document. We believe in constitutional government. The Constitution, however, as fine as it is, did not in its first amendment make provision for, or literally spell out in detail, what at the time it was written would no doubt have been included had our forefathers foreseen these problems.

While I am not an authority on government or politics, it is quite possible that many of the Supreme Court decisions through the years have been influenced by public opinion. Minority groups are often more vociferous than majority groups and thus create a climate, while majority groups are silent and inactive. If all Christians had been as united and as persistent as some of the minority groups, the entire atmosphere might have been different. I am certainly not saying that the Court was influenced by minority pressure, but am saying that I can well imagine that certain of these groups worked day and night to create the climate which helped to make this decision easier. It is quite obvious that the climate was probably never right for such a decision until now. It seems that some of the great church groups acquiesced long before the decision was announced. What would have happened if all Christian had been as determined as the atheists and perhaps some others? I do not know. I only raise some questions.

The ruling does not seem to me to make for brotherhood and unity of some of the differing faiths.

While the decision may not necessarily increase the prestige of the Supreme Court on the part of many, I should hope that as confusing and bewildering as it is to multiplied thousands of people, that somehow we might retain respect for law, order, and constitutional government. Dean Griswold, of the Harvard Law School, has well said, "An institution charged with the role which the Supreme Court has successfully filled for so many years is entitled to our respect and understanding. If one criticizes the Court (as people have always done in the past, and should do in the future), it should be essentially for the purpose of trying to contribute to that respect and to that understanding. The debt which we all owe to the Court is far greater than any individual can repay."

The decision offers us the challenge as Christians to reexamine ourselves, our homes, and our churches. Many of us will do as the Governor of North Carolina says they will do. He says, "We will go on having the Bible reading and prayers in the schools. We do not require the Bible reading and praying, but do these things because we want to." The Governor added, "As I read the decision this kind of thing is not forbidden by the Court, and, indeed it should not be."

This decision challenges us to be more loyal and dedicated Christians than ever, to support the program of worship and education in our churches, to maintain a family altar, pray and read the Bible daily in our homes, and to teach our children to do so.

Our Nation has a great religious heritage for which we must ever be grateful to Almighty God, and we must fight harder than ever to deepen and maintain it, as well as perpetuate it.

This decision shows us plainly where the center of responsibility is—upon us as individuals, upon the local church and denomination, upon every individual believer in God to pray harder, more often, more effectively and earnestly than ever before, to read our Bibles, and to do everything we know how to measure up to our responsibility.

It reminds us again of the historic position of Baptists regarding religious liberty and the separation of church and state, a position we have fought for and cherished and must not deny.

One of the questions that arises in our minds now is, What's next? Already a complaint has been filed in reference to the use of "under God" in the Oath of Allegiance to the flag of the United States. How much longer will it be until someone complains about the age-old requirement of opening both Houses of our national Congress with prayer? How much longer will our State legislative bodies be opened with prayer and Bible reading? How much longer will dear Uncle Sam be allowed to print on the coins of our beloved Nation, "In God we trust"? How much longer will we have chaplains in our Federal and State institutions, build chapels, and hold religious services? How much longer will the U.S. Government be permitted to maintain a great program of chaplains and chapels in all branches of our military service? How much longer will the Government exempt church property from taxation? Commencement sermons? Christmas carols? Use Bible for swearing public officials and jurors? Have prayer at inauguration of Presidents?

As in the past, the answers to these questions depend largely upon the character and faith of the American Republic, and this means you and me.

There is one logical deduction that is absolutely certain and it is this: It is high time for the American people to get back to their churches and give them their full, loyal, enthusiastic support.

A dear friend of mine who has been bruised in many a political battle, whose name is well-known throughout the United States and who holds a position close to the President of the United States, told me recently of his plans to give more time to his church than ever before. As we walked toward the plane together for him to go to another city for our Government he said, "Jim, the church has more to say on things that are happening today than Government does, you know. I am going to give more time to my church."

What about you? What are you going to do?

Some years ago a little church on the coast of England was destroyed by a hurricane. The British Admiralty inquired if they were going to reconstruct it, and when told that the members were not able financially to do so, said: "If you do not rebuild the church, we will. That spire is on all our charts and

¹ Edward B. Pusey, author, "Collegiate and Professional Teaching and Discipline."

July 9

11592

maps. It is the landmark by which the ships of seven seas steer their course."
Let us get back to church.

CUBAN LIBERATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on June 17 I offered in this Chamber a proposal for Cuban liberation. My motives were, in the deepest sense, nonpolitical and nonpartisan. I spoke then, and again today, as one profoundly disturbed American—but with the special obligation of representing in this highest court of public deliberation what I judge to be the firm will of the American people.

My proposal was offered explicitly—and I reiterate the point today—as one possible course of action, designed to fulfill our Government's own repeated pledge to restore to the Cuban people their shattered liberties. It was designed not to assert this Nation's authority over Cuba's destiny—we have no such authority—but to extend to the Cuban people an opportunity to resume their own sovereign course within the free world community. It was offered as one way to fulfill President Kennedy's own pledge that Cuba must once more be free.

One possible course of action—I repeat and underscore these words. Not the only or even necessarily the best course of action, but one that would capitalize on our unique strengths and would thus move us out of the shoals of endless procrastination and toward our avowed goals. My proposal was offered in direct response to the administration's repeated challenge to all the critics of its Cuba policy, ever since the moral and military disaster of the Bay of Pigs: What alternative do you offer? What would you have us do?

Here, in the form of a proposal for Cuban liberation, was one alternative—sober, serious, and with full awareness of this Nation's complex obligations—legal, diplomatic, and moral. In proposing that we both challenge and stimulate the fragmented forces of free Cuba to compose their differences and then to spearhead their ultimate self-liberation, I was responding to the administration's appeal. In proposing that we offer both sanctuary and a territorial base at Guantanamo Bay to a broadly representative free Cuban provisional government, in proposing that we then recognize this strictly interim government as the sole legitimate agent of Cuban sovereignty, I was attempting to offer one responsible alternative to the administration's policy of futile and timid indecision.

My proposal of June 17, for Cuban liberation, was offered as a stimulus to reasoned debate and deliberation—and, ultimately, to decisive and effective action.

But what has been the response? First, silence. To this day, indeed, no official administration spokesman has come forward with either an effective critique or a better alternative. Then some nameless and faceless "Mr. Anonymous" in the State Department did deign to respond: He called my proposal "insane." I must admit, to be sure, that the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of this body's Committee on Foreign Relations did not discuss my

proposal simply as "insane." By now, the response had escalated to "foolish, dangerous, imprudent, and ill considered," with the charge of "illegal" tossed in for good measure.

But let me not be misunderstood: It is not offended personal pride that moves me to reply. Such a consideration is less than minor. What is important—supremely important, is this Nation's security. What matters is this Nation's honor in the free world community—and its credibility within the walls of the Kremlin. What matters is the value of this Nation's pledged word in the councils of world opinion. And what matters is the dignity of the U.S. Senate as a responsible assembly of deliberation, debate, and decision.

All these considerations are of overriding importance, now that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has chosen to spread upon the record what we can only assume is the administration's considered response to a proposal for Cuban liberation. This tangle of unrational conclusions cannot go unanswered. And I repeat that what is at stake is, equally, this Nation's security and the honor of its solemn word. If the world's greatest deliberative assembly is to fulfill its high mission, we must first pause to consider the administration's case—and then get on with the great tasks before us. If the administration will not make good its own pledges, it is up to the U.S. Senate to assume the burden of responsible decision.

The subcommittee chairman begins by asking "Who is to decide upon the composition" of what he chooses to call a government-in-exile, and "where is such a government to derive any right to claim to be the government of the Cuban people?" Let me suggest that the Senate study the record: The proposal for Cuban liberation could not be more explicit.

First, it challenges the leaders of the Cuban expatriates themselves to reconcile their differences; to unite behind the one goal of national liberation; and to demonstrate that they are, indeed, broadly and truly representative of all democratic groups and parties in pre-Castro Cuba.

Second, the proposal contemplates no government-in-exile at all, in the traditional sense, but rather a provisional government with but two mandates: To spearhead the ultimate liberation of their homeland, and to prepare the way for free elections by the whole Cuban people—after which their work would be done.

And third, if such an interim government could not legitimately discharge this limited mandate, so clearly in the interest of all freedom-loving Cubans, how then can the Castro-Communists be said to legitimately represent anyone at all—except their own masters in the Kremlin?

There have been no elections in Cuba since January 1959, contrary to Castro's solemn pledge. The Castro gang—and it is just that, nothing better—can claim no popular mandate, except under the threat of its guns and its Soviet-backed regime of terror. By the terms of the

Declaration on the Offensive of Communism in America, proclaimed at Punta del Este in January 1962, and subscribed to by every free republic of the Americas, the Castro regime has usurped the sovereignty of the Cuban people. It is in blatant contempt of every requirement for legitimate democratic rule, as specified in sections 3 and 4 of that declaration of hemispheric policy.

I must also ask this defender of the administration—and I must presume that is what he is—to consider a further fact: if he is now so outraged by the possibility of the United States—as he puts it—"picking" and "choosing" a free Cuban government, what does he conceive to have been the purpose of our disastrous operation at the Bay of Pigs? We have the word of one of the highest administration officials, of the Attorney General himself, that its precise purpose was to secure a beachhead for a provisional government—one that most certainly would have been, to use the Senator's word again, an American "puppet." And this, expressly, is what my proposal seeks to avoid.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in his reply next points out that, in every past case of U.S. recognition of exile governments, there were in existence duly constituted regimes that had been forcibly ejected from their own territory. Were the free French such a duly constituted government? Was De Gaulle forcibly ejected? But these are relatively minor points. What is important is that no one then seriously questioned the legitimate right of these free governments—the French, the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians—to represent the aspirations of their people for ultimate liberation, for the restoration of their freedom, and for the chance to reassert the privileges of national sovereignty. And today, no one could seriously doubt the parallel claim of a free Cuban provisional government. The Senator's suggestion that the utterly discredited Batista regime is "the only group we could possibly recognize as a Cuban government in exile" is frivolous—and it flies in the face of the historical record. It reduces the niceties of law to a shameful absurdity.

The Senator tacitly concedes the frivolity of this argument by turning next to a most curious, tortured, and—inadvertently or not—a most revealing line of reasoning. He says:

I do not think many people realize that as a matter of international law, the United States still recognizes the Castro government of Cuba.

I agree with him. Most Americans do not realize this fact, and a shocking realization it must be. We continue to play this immoral game—and for what reason? I quote again from the distinguished subcommittee chairman:

It is the Government which we hold responsible for living up to Cuba's international obligations.

What obligations? What responsibility?

The record is clear—every broken scrap of it. This is a bandit regime, maintained in power by Soviet arms, manipulated in world councils as a

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11593

bought-and-paid-for puppet of world communism's aggressive designs. Castro has held his international obligations, his responsibility to respect foreign properties, in the same utter contempt with which he has treated the rights of the Cuban people. He has trampled on them at will. If Castro's respect for international law and for human dignity is the hinge on which our Cuban policy turns, then the situation is grave indeed—and the need for a bold new initiative could not be more urgent.

The next point in what we can only assume to be the administration case simply indicates that the subcommittee chairman has not bothered to study the proposal he is criticizing. He says:

We cannot recognize two governments at the same time.

Of course, we cannot—nor does the proposal contemplate doing any such thing. At exactly the same moment that a provisional government has established itself, and has satisfied our Government of its broadly representative character, we would extend it recognition as the sole legitimate agent of Cuban sovereignty. The shameful fiction that the Castro-Communists represent anything except their Soviet masters would be at an end at that time. By our new act of recognition, consistent with every usage of international law, the Castro regime would be branded as a regime of usurpers—politically, legally, and morally illegitimate. And, this new government—established, by our invitation, on its own soil at Guantanamo—could be the rallying point for a new, free, democratic government. This government, we are now told, would be totally incapable of fulfilling Cuba's treaty obligations. Why? This we are not told. Not only could it do so, but also this Nation should be prepared to enter into negotiations with it to clarify all the technicalities, all the legal details governing our perpetual lease at Guantanamo—which would be of greatest immediate interest—as well as the ultimate restoration of Cuban freedom through democratic elections. And, we could at least have hope that this provisional government would meet its treaty obligations—something the Castro-Communists have not done and vow never to do.

The Senator speaks of "some form of election" to be conducted in the immediate future—but any such election would be a fraud, under present conditions. He warns that the United States would have "the responsibility for setting up the ground rules"—but that is precisely what the liberation proposal seeks to avoid. Our responsibility would be simply to extend an opportunity to the forces of free Cuba—to unite behind the goal of liberation and then, when the whole Cuban people can deliberate freely, to pick and choose and elect for themselves. The burdens of sovereign power would be on the Cuban patriots—not as U.S. puppets, as the Senator calls them, but as our equal partners in the free world community.

As if all these difficulties were not enough, we are next informed that the

liberation proposal would be illegal, that it would violate the treaty and agreements governing our perpetual lease at Guantanamo. Let us leave aside the Senator's implication that he has some manner of "hot line" to the World Court and "knows" what its finding would be. The basic answer—again, the proposal could not be more explicit—is this: There will surely be legal technicalities to be adjudicated, once the provisional government is established at Guantanamo. But all subsequent negotiations would be conducted between the United States and what would, at that time, be the only legitimate Cuban regime—the provisional government of free Cuba.

The claim of illegality goes further, however, and proceeds to misconstrue the language of the treaty governing the Guantanamo lease. First, pertaining to the strictest legal interpretation of the treaty, the Cuban people are granted, under terms of the treaty, "ultimate sovereignty" over the Guantanamo base, and their own legitimate Government's use of the land, or a small part of it, cannot be construed as a violation of Cuban rights. For the recognized Government of Cuba to make its home on its own soil is not a usage of the base or its land by the United States at all—it is rather an exercise of Cuba's sovereign authority.

However, the claim of illegality made by the chairman of the subcommittee goes further, and in my opinion, as well as the opinion of many lawyers pre-eminent—and I repeat the word "pre-eminent"—in the field of international law, misinterprets the provisions of the executive agreements and the treaty with the Republic of Cuba in four respects:

First. With respect to the words "for use as coaling or naval stations only, and for no other purposes," these words are contained in the agreement of February 23, 1903. The subsequent actual lease agreement of the same year, on August 17, contains no such words as "and for no other purpose," although the latter instrument spells out in detail the relationship between the parties—that is, the United States and Cuba.

The limitation contained in the first agreement is in article II of that instrument. Article I of the same agreement makes the general grant of the land and adjoining waters for "the purposes of coaling and naval stations." Article II, however, is limited to "the waters adjacent to said areas of land and water, and to improve and deepen the entrances thereto and the anchorages therein." It is plain that article II pertains to waters and anchorages, and the limitation implicit in article II "and for no other purpose" pertains only to the waters and anchorages. If it was intended to be a limitation to the entire agreement, it would be placed in a separate paragraph. No such limitation was placed in the subsequent lease agreement applying to the base as a whole, nor in the subsequent treaty of 1934. The best possible construction that the administration could take therefore, is that it does create an obscurity. It is the best the

administration could contend in attacking the plan I offer.

Second. With respect to recognition of the "ultimate sovereignty of the Republic of Cuba" over the area of our base, the liberation proposal simply confirms this fact. And the U.S. Government, in all future dealings with the provisional free Cuban government, ought to do the same. This, of course, gets us to the crucial point. Far from fulfilling all its legal obligations, the Castro regime has put us on notice—clear and repeated—that it has no intention of respecting our rights at Guantanamo—that we remain there on Castro's sufferance and at his whim. He has not so much as cashed a single one of our rent checks. As early as August 1961, his Foreign Minister denounced the Guantanamo accords before the U.N. General Assembly. This denunciation was repeated by Castro's puppet President, Dorticos, in October 1962, and by Castro himself later in the same month. Where does this leave our treaty rights? Is this what the Senator means by "fulfilling obligations"? Precisely the strength of the liberation proposal is that it would affirm the ultimate sovereignty of a free Cuba over all its territory—and, at the same time, our own perpetual rights over the Guantanamo base. Let us face facts: what today deters Castro from marching on Guantanamo is hardly his profound respect for legal obligation. It is plainly and bluntly, the presence of U.S. armed might—that, and that alone.

Third. On another point with respect to the treaty and to the question of legality, the Senator tends to trip over his own tangled logic. First he points out that, under the terms of the treaty, we would be bound to deliver up to Castro's perverted justice those members of the Guantanamo provisional government whom Castro would brand as traitors and fugitives from justice. He seems to forget that, earlier, he had complained of the lack of such people—expelled from their own land by force—as a bar to the establishment of an exile government. More important, he seems to forget that once such a government was established at Guantanamo, our relations with Castro would be finished. All our future dealings would be with this new provisional government. And the members of this government, far from being traitors, could only be described as patriots—the legitimate interim representatives of the ultimate sovereignty of the Cuban people.

Fourth. The rather spurious argument has been raised that this would violate article III of the second or August 17, 1903, agreement which forbids the establishment of a commercial, industrial, or other enterprise. I am sure that the eminent critic had his tongue in cheek when he advanced this argument.

These arguments by the Senator from Oregon with respect to legality cannot be taken seriously. They are smoke-screens. They are not arguments at all, but rather evasions of the major issues involved. They are debaters' tricks, not serious responses to a responsible pro-

posal. And they are implicit concessions that the administration's defense is on a par with its Cuba policy: weak, timid, indecisive. It is built of empty rhetoric, not substantial action.

Now, what was said about the proposal for a pacific blockade made by the Senator from Nebraska? Having disposed of the liberation proposal, he turned next to the bold proposal of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for a full-scale blockade of Castro's Communist base—two proposals, let me say, that are mutually consistent and fully complementary—that is, the liberation proposal and the blockade proposal. On this, he attempted to write off such a pacific blockade as an act of war. Now, even assuming that we dare not so much as contemplate such an act—which, in the context of the Communist strategy of relentless aggressive pressure, is an assumption both dangerous and unwarranted—the conclusion that it constitutes an act of war is untrue. It is doubly untrue.

In the first place, international legal authorities consider a pacific blockade to be fully justified, in the face of grave threats to the security of the blockading power; both the U.N. and the OAS charters recognize such an extreme contingency.

Secondly, no act of war is involved unless and until the target of the blockade chooses to consider it so; and even then, the response may run a broad spectrum, from the use of counterforce to mere diplomatic protests.

One is compelled to ask: Has the administration, has the subcommittee chairman, learned nothing from the confrontation of October 1962? At that time, the United States mounted what was, in every essential, a pacific blockade. To be sure, we invented a new term to cover the situation—we called it a quarantine. And we have it on the highest authority—from the State Department's own legal adviser—that a legal justification for this act had pretty much to be devised on the fly, step by unprecedented step. But the fact remains that, in its essence and in its effect, this was a pacific blockade, the same kind of blockade proposed by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

What happened? The blockade worked. It earned the prompt and near-unanimous support of the free world and, more to the point, of the OAS community. In the face of this bold initiative, the Soviet Union backed down. Our failure to capitalize on this opportunity and to press our advantage to its logical conclusion—the Soviet presence remains in Cuba, if indeed it does not grow—should not be permitted to obscure the major point. When we acted with forthright and unequivocal purpose, it was the Communists who blinked, not the United States.

But now, we are told, the threat is past. The provocation is at an end. We have it on the authority of both the Senator from Oregon and his junior colleague from South Dakota that Cuba is no longer a "clear and acute" menace to U.S. and free world security. It is, rather, an "obsession" or a "fixation." Action appropriate in October is, by now,

warmongering. What worked in October will fail now. In the approved jargon, both the liberation proposal and a pacific blockade will be "counterproductive," whatever that means.

The administration, and all its spokesmen and apologists, are either misinformed or blind. They are living in a dreamworld, wedded to the illusion that the urgent problems of this hemisphere can be effectively solved—some fine day, later rather than sooner—by socioeconomic uplift and by massive infusions of U.S. aid.

But the facts remain. And the facts—more chillingly documented with each passing day—point to a mounting Communist offensive against every free government of Latin America. Their techniques are infiltration and penetration by trained revolutionary cadres, psychological and political warfare, systematic subversion, and planned murder and violence.

Our response must be projected on the same scale. Anything less is doomed to deluge us and ultimately fail. Brave words are not enough. It is time, and more than time, for bold acts—for decisive acts designed to cope with this cancerous menace deep within the heartland of the free world, but 90 miles from our own shores. The Cuban base of world Communist imperialism must be removed. And toward this irreducible goal, the Castro bandit regime must be replaced by a free government, representative of the sovereign Cuban people. There can be no "ifs" or "buts" or "eventuallys" about it. This, and this only, must be the undeviating focus on which our policy is fixed.

I said it on June 17. I repeated it today at the outset of my remarks. And now—for a third time—I say it again: if my proposal for Cuban liberation is somehow flawed, if it is inappropriate to the urgent need, if it is insufficient to meet our avowed purposes, then let us put it aside. But first—and this question I direct to the highest officials of the executive branch, for spokesmen will no longer do—what is your alternative? What do you propose instead? What, in short, is our policy with respect to Cuban liberation, and when can we expect to reach this overriding goal?

I appeal to every Member of this body: let us not be still, let us not relax our pressure, until these questions are answered. And more than answered: let us demand decisive acts—assurances that, at long last, the march toward Cuban liberation has begun.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I congratulate the senior Senator from Colorado on his very clear statement. It behooves Senators to turn their attention to a discussion of the steps which can be taken to end the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere, particularly while there is still time to do so short of war.

The senior Senator from Colorado made a suggestion which is worthy of consideration. He suggested a plan of action for the location of a government that represented Cuba. That suggestion deserves consideration, not only by the Senate, but also by the executive department. It is regrettable that it should be denounced as ill advised or as warmongering.

An attitude that causes our Nation to put its head in the sand in reference to what is going on in Cuba and in the surrounding areas will lead to a situation in which armed combat is inevitable.

It has been said that the suggestion for a provisional government, and the suggestion which the junior Senator from Nebraska has repeatedly made, for a pacific blockade, do not apply now, as they did last October, because there does not exist a clear and present danger.

That statement is not supported by the findings of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Forces. The whole tenor of its findings is that there is a clear and present danger to this country.

Speaking of Cuba, the subcommittee said:

It provides a base for training of agents from other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational, and sabotage techniques.

If sabotage does not create danger, if revolution does not create danger, if support of communism does not create danger, how does danger exist?

The report of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services went on to say that unless this problem is met and dealt with, it will not end with Cuba; but that, one by one, these nations will fall into the hands of Communists—Russian Communists, if you please—and the United States will be isolated from friendly powers. The danger does exist. Suggestions have been made for meeting it.

I again congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

I call attention to the fact that on page 10935 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 25, 1963, there is a discussion of the legal authorities with respect to a pacific blockade. It was none other than Franklin D. Roosevelt who, early in 1939, said:

The mere fact that we rightly decline to intervene with arms to prevent acts of aggression does not mean that we must act as if there were no aggression at all. Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74).

Hyde, in his "International Law chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States," volume II, page 1654, states:

International law recognizes the use of nonmilitary measures short of war to check the commission of such acts of aggression.

The American Journal of International Law for April 1953, referring to

1963

the suggestion of a blockade of the Chinese Communists, said:

In short, the idea of using the weapon of blockade against Communist China, without war, is not excluded by international law.

A pacific blockade is one in which the blockading nation intends to compel the blockaded nation to take certain action or to cease from taking action, and is not a part of an invasion or a war. It is true that the intent of a blockading nation is also involved. That risk was taken last October. Whatever one wishes to call it, whether it be a quarantine or what not, it was a blockade type of remedy, and it worked.

In a pacific blockade, the ships and cargoes of the countries whose vessels are the victims of the blockade cannot be seized; they must return to their own ports. But as a matter of self-defense, just as we had the right of blockade last October, we have it now, because the overall situation in Cuba is not improved.

I thank the Senator from Colorado.
 Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I believe that this series of carefully considered and logically presented remarks with regard to the great problem of Cuba deserves not only the passionate consideration of the Senate but of the American people, as well. The Senator from Colorado is entitled to high praise and favorable comment for the time and effort he has devoted to this important subject.

The issue of Cuba simply will not "down" with the American people. The Senator from Colorado is bringing out what every American knows; namely, that the presence of a Russian army in a Russian-dominated country, in violation of the Monroe Doctrine; the arrogance of Communist forces; the failure of this administration to take any action; the unwillingness of this administration to face facts—brutal facts; and an aggressive horde of evilly disposed persons in a position to render us continuously insecure, constitute a menace to the safety of every American. So long as it is ignored, so long as it is treated as if it would go away, I am certain that the American people will never feel secure in their own homes, their own localities, or their own country, until something is done to correct the situation.

I am glad that the Senator from Nebraska has brought out in his colloquy the fact that there are two kinds of blockades. We have all heard much talk and many smug statements to the effect that a blockade is an act of war. Whenever I have discussed Cuba, I have met with the reaction, "Oh, you must not talk about a blockade, because a blockade is an act of war." We are often met by categorical, imperative statements, statements which sound good but are totally untrue. Such statements are often made to avoid logic, to discourage thinking, to end a discussion which is unpleasant for some persons to hear.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Would not the Senator say that the statement that Cuba is no longer a menace because the missiles have been removed is in the same category?

Mr. SCOTT. Of course. To say that Cuba is no longer a menace because some weapons have been removed is to close one's eyes and ears to the obvious fact that the greater menace is not the current presence of any weapons. The present menace is the continuing presence of any army whose government is dedicated to the destruction of the free world. That army is closer, more dangerously situated, and more evilly disposed than any army has ever been in the history of the American Republic.

To say that a blockade is an act of war is not to state the factual situation, because when the administration imposed a blockade on October 22, last, it did not, under international law, change the fact that it was a blockade merely by calling it a quarantine.

Interestingly enough, the word "quarantine" is one which had been used by the former Vice President, Mr. Nixon, in an earlier speech. It was apparently seized upon by the present administration to indicate that there was some kind of difference between a quarantine and a blockade.

But when the President announced on October 22, 1962, that our military forces were so disposed as to prevent the passage of vessels of other countries en route to Cuba, that statement meant exactly what it said, namely, that for the time the danger lasted, which was very brief, namely, if Russian ships or Russian-controlled ships entered the zone of our frontiers and pierced those zones to communicate with Cuba for the unloading of military and other supplies, the United States would be prepared to stop them and use such force as was necessary. That, in international law, is a blockade. We had imposed a blockade, and it was not an act of war. That is what impresses me. Why the administration must say that a blockade is an act of war, after it had imposed a blockade which was not an act of war, I cannot understand.

So I should not only like to stress my agreement with the point which the Senator has been making here, but I should like it to continue to have it made as clear as it can be made that a blockade by the Organization of American States—an economic blockade or perhaps a military blockade—does not need to be an act of war.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. In the absence of definite action or a definite policy by the administration, I believe it is up to Senators to discuss these questions, and perhaps out of the discussion to develop some policy for the Federal Government.

Whether it be this particular plan or whether out of it other plans develop is insignificant. The point is that we must move.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield again, briefly, so that I may make one further observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The fact that there has been nothing but an ominous quiet from our Department of State and from elsewhere in our Government may indicate that action of some kind is pending. I hope it does not indicate that nothing will be done until another time of crisis—one similar to that of October 1960, or perhaps a practice run or trial run in October 1963, to see how it goes. So I hope we shall not have to wait until another October crisis arises. I hope that, instead, this continuing, daily menace is recognized by our Government, is met by our Government, and is treated by our Government as the dangerous, continuing crisis which it is, and not a matter to be deferred until a convenient time when it may have the desired impact upon American public opinion. When an enemy menaces us, the time to act is at once. Now the enemy menaces us; and this is the time for us to act, rather than wait for a further series of October crises and October brainwashings of the American people.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for his observations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his valuable contributions.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

I wish to add my congratulations on the very fine service he is rendering in leading this effort to attempt to formulate a policy with respect to Cuba which we can discuss in constructive terms throughout the country.

I was very much interested in the remarks, the other day, of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], in which he indicated that the menace of Cuba has passed, and that the provocation is at an end—a subject which my colleague has discussed today in his remarks on the floor.

I hold in my hand a copy of a report from Cuba which states specifically that work there is going on feverishly in the caves, in the mine zones, and in the coastal regions, and that they have been receiving large shipments of reinforced concrete, steel girders, and all types of heavy building materials which have been arriving at the indicated places late at night, in trucks driven by Cuban militiamen, who then have turned them over to Russian drivers, after their arrival at the specific areas; and the report goes into considerable detail in regard to the actions occurring there. As to the accuracy of this report, I have no way of knowing; but the information which constantly is coming in on the activities of the Russians in Cuba and on the acti-

July 9

vities of the Castro government itself indicates clearly that this is a menace which still exists, and that—as the Senate committee report itself states—we have no way of knowing whether all the missiles have been taken out of Cuba. We think they have been, but we do not know for certain.

So I do not believe we can possibly say that this menace is at an end, or that it will be at an end before the Russians leave there.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it will be recalled that sometime ago I said here on the floor that it seemed to me that our foreign policy had been based on two fundamental principles: one, that if we do not irritate the Communists, they will soon change their spots, and will be something we can live with; second, that we should not embarrass Khrushchev in any way, because if our embarrassing him led to his downfall, we might find it more difficult to deal with someone who would replace him.

All through this we can see a policy of accommodate and withdraw, accommodate and withdraw.

I have noted an article which bears particularly on our Cuban policy.

The article is an Allen-Scott report entitled "Shift in U.S. Policy on Castro," and it was published on July 1 in the Colorado Springs Gazette-Telegraph. I wish to read a portion of the article, because I think it bears particularly on the point my colleague [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] have been discussing, which also has been discussed by so many of the rest of us who have been trying to force the adoption of a positive course of action.

I now read from the article:

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is deliberating a gradual shift in U.S. policy toward Dictator Fidel Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

For more than a month, the President and his top foreign policy advisers have been discussing a plan under which the United States would resume "contact" with Castro on both "an informal and formal basis."

Under this backstage scheme, New York Attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the \$53 million ransom of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners, would fly to Havana and Moscow to seek the withdrawal of all Soviet combat forces from Cuba.

In exchange for their removal, the United States would agree to a step-by-step normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with the Red-ruled Castro dictatorship over a 2-year period.

As a first step, the United States would reopen its Embassy in Havana by sending a chargé d'affaires there. At present the Swiss Ambassador is handling U.S. affairs.

An exchange of Ambassadors and lifting of the trade embargo against Castro would follow after sufficient time had elapsed to make such a drastic "readjustment" palatable to the people and Congress.

This far-reaching shift in Cuban relations is part of President Kennedy's policy of seeking accommodations with Russia and its satellite bloc for the avowed purpose of reducing the risk of nuclear war by moderating tensions.

White House insiders say the proposed switch in Cuba policy fits squarely with strategy enunciated recently by the President in a speech that "any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account conditions and potential developments between the United States and U.S.S.R."

Mr. President, it seems to me that this report is so serious and is backed by so much evidence along these lines that we should have a clear, unequivocal answer as to whether this is the purpose and whether these are the steps which will be taken by the administration, or whether we shall have a positive formula of foreign policy devised to try to regain the rights of free people in Cuba to govern themselves. I wish to add this to the statements my colleague has been making, which I think have been extremely valuable throughout.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of my distinguished colleague. He raises so many questions that I hope he will take the opportunity to discuss this matter on the floor, because if the President's plan is followed through, will there be any assurance that there will be a liberation of the people of Cuba? Will there be any assurance that there will be free elections there? And, most important of all, will there be any assurance that Communist subversion and activities of violence and murder in the Western Hemisphere will come to an end, if we enter into such an accommodation with Cuba?

The fact is that the Russians, the Communists, have been stopped only when they have been met with extreme firmness. However, under the wonderful policy—and I use the term with considerable sarcasm, of course—which we in this country seem so intent on following—that of coexistence—they seem to be making additional strides.

On reading the press in Latin America, it is difficult to point to one bright spot or one place in Latin America or in South America where conditions have improved in recent years or in recent months.

Under these circumstances I believe we have a right to know what the policy is. If it is not to be announced at the top levels, we shall try to hammer out a policy on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield once more, I wish to say, in answer to the first questions propounded, although I know they are rhetorical, that the fact is that if the President goes through with the type of proposal that I said had been reported on—and I do not know whether it is what he is considering, though I hope it is not—he will be in fact putting into a position of uncontrolled authority the very people that we are trying to get out of Cuba—namely, the Communists—and the free people of Cuba—they will be the ones who will suffer less than those in Latin America and Central America.

Mr. ALLOTT. My colleague is entirely correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the senior Senator from Colorado will yield, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Colorado a question.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Has the junior Senator from Colorado asked consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which he referred?

Mr. DOMINICK. Not yet. I have it available, and I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope there are ways and means by which we can obtain some categorical answers as to whether the policy to which the Senator has referred is being seriously considered by our Government. The junior Senator from Colorado has raised some extremely serious questions, in my opinion.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from which I quoted be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Colorado Springs Gazette Telegraph, July 1, 1963]

SHIFT IN U.S. POLICY ON CASTRO

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is deliberating a gradual shift in U.S. policy toward Dictator Fidel Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

For more than a month, the President and his top foreign policy advisers have been discussing a plan under which the United States would resume "contact" with Castro on both "an informal and formal basis."

Under this backstage scheme, New York Attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the \$53 million ransom of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners, would fly to Havana and Moscow to seek the withdrawal of all Soviet combat forces from Cuba.

In exchange for their removal, the United States would agree to a step-by-step normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with the Red-ruled Castro dictatorship over a 2-year period.

As a first step, the United States would reopen its Embassy in Havana by sending a Chargé d'Affaires there. At present the Swiss Ambassador is handling U.S. affairs.

An exchange of Ambassadors and lifting of the trade embargo against Castro would follow after sufficient time had elapsed to make such a drastic "readjustment" palatable to the people and Congress.

This far-reaching shift in Cuban relations is part of President Kennedy's policy of seeking accommodations with Russia and its satellite bloc for the avowed purpose of reducing the risk of nuclear war by moderating tensions.

White House insiders say the proposed switch in Cuba policy fits squarely with strategy enunciated recently by the President in a speech that "any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account conditions and potential developments between the United States and the U.S.S.R."

THE NEGOTIATOR

The President favors 47-year-old Donovan for this highly explosive diplomatic mission for two reasons: his "acceptability" to Castro and Khrushchev, and his close ties with key administration officials, notably Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

After Donovan arranged the swap of Soviet spy Abel for U-2 Pilot Francis Gary Powers, the President wrote him, "The type of negotiations you undertook, where diplomatic channels had been unavailing, is unique, and you conducted it with the greatest skill and courage."

Castro's enthusiasm for Donovan is about on a par with that of the President. In feelers through diplomatic channels to the State Department, the Cuban dictator has indicated he would accept Donovan as negotiator. Words to that effect have been conveyed on three separate occasions—March 8, May 12, and May 19.

A decision on this momentous scheme will not be made until after the President returns from his European trip.

1963

By that time the White House staff hopes to know whether the House Foreign Affairs Committee will undertake an inquiry into Donovan's previous Cuban negotiations. Republican committeemen are vigorously pressing for such an investigation. They have strongly urged it in a joint letter to Representative THOMAS MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman.

CUBAN FLASHES

Richard Goodwin, freewheeling Executive Secretary of the International Peace Corps, is still on the State Department's payroll. The House Appropriations Committee has ascertained that Goodwin is drawing \$19,656 as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, although he left that post more than 4 months ago. Meanwhile, Sterling Cotrell, who replaced Goodwin, is being paid by the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. The House committee began checking Goodwin's pay as Congress voted down his request for \$80,000 to set up the new Peace Corps organization. At a meeting with British officials, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., special Assistant to the President, described U.S. policy on Cuba along these lines: The first objective is to clean up our own backyard in Central and South America by vigorous implementation of the Alliance for Progress. The second objective is to bring isolated Cuba back into the Organization of American States as a chastened, cooperating member. (Nice tricks, if they can be pulled off.)

Intelligence reports that around 100,000 Cubans are in Castro's jails for refusing to accept communism. Also that some 250,000 Cubans have fled, and another 180,000 are awaiting approval and transportation to leave. Senator JOHN STENNIS' Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee is preparing a new report on Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against Latin American countries. The report, slated for release next month, will warn that Castro has ordered an increase in these operations.

Although Castro has loudly proclaimed fealty and devotion to Russia, a so-called Cuban "scientific delegation," headed by a Capt. Antonio Nunez Jimenez, is en route to Red China, ostensibly for "study and observation" purposes. Beer bottles have become so scarce in Communist Cuba that the output of beer has been seriously affected. Apparently there is no lack of beer, but there aren't enough bottles to hold it. In an effort to overcome this shortage, the "Revolutionary Taxicab Drivers Association" of Santiago has pledged to collect beer bottles free of charge. Presumably the cab drivers will devote their spare time to rounding up empty bottles. Russia, whose agriculture is notoriously in difficulty, is sending around 100 so-called farm "specialists" to help Cuba with its mounting agricultural headaches—a clear-cut instance of the incompetent aiding the inadequate.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL CITY AS A SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a study which I have had made on the historical background of the establishment of a Federal city as the seat of government in this country. It is a study which should be of great interest to Senators and to the public as to why Washington was set up as a Federal city under the complete and exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL CITY AS THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

In Philadelphia, June 21, 1783, during the Continental Congress, there occurred an event, the memory of which would later profoundly influence the founding of our Nation's Capital as a Federal city. An eyewitness account reported in the Freedman's Journal, stated: ¹

"About 2 weeks ago, advice was received from col. Butler commanding officer at Lancaster, that the troops there discovered a very discontented temper which he apprehended would soon break out into some open acts of mutiny. A few days after * * * a party had actually thrown off all obedience to their officers, and marched to Philadelphia, notwithstanding the utmost exertions of their officers to prevent it. Accordingly on Thursday the 17th² about 80 soldiers without officers, but completely armed * * * marched down Market Street and proceeded to the barracks, where there were quartered * * * different corps to the amount of 400 in the whole. No measures were taken, except conferences between the president and council and congress, till the Saturday following when to the astonishment of the city, and the public dishonor, these troops, with fixed bayonets and drums beating, marched into the state house; the seat of Congress, and the supreme executive council. Having placed guards at the different doors, and sent off detachments to those places where they supposed arms and ammunition were deposited, they sent up a written paper to the president and council desiring that they might be authorized to choose their own officers, and demanding an answer in 20 minutes, or an enraged soldiery would be let in upon them. No address was made to Congress, which was assembled upon special business; but not chusing to deliberate under the bayonets of an armed mob, they retired without any other insult offered to them, collectively or individually. In the mean time, the soldiery grew very clamorous, complaining of the detention of their pay * * * of the nonsettlement of their accounts, and attempts to disband them without settlement, intermixed with general reproaches on public authority of every kind * * * and threats of violence if their complaints were not instantly attended to."

The letter which informed the Continental Congress of the impending mutiny was referred to a committee which met with the Supreme Executive Council of the State of Pennsylvania. The Executive Council did not follow the suggestion of the committee that the State of Pennsylvania send the militia to halt the mutiny, so the committee of the Congress felt there was "no alternative but to endeavour to dissuade the mutineers from coming to town."

As is evident from the newspaper story quoted above, the attempts at dissuasion were fruitless, and the mutinous troops arrived at Philadelphia on Thursday, June 17, 1783.

¹ The Freedman's Journal or the North American Intelligencer, July 2, 1783, p. 2.

² Although the writer of this story says the reader may be "assured of its authenticity," all other records available indicate that the march took place on Thursday, June 19, 1783.

³ This information comes from a report entered into the Congressional Journal, reprinted in the Freedman's Journal or the North American Intelligencer, July 16, 1783, p. 1.

⁴ Ibid.

On June 21, the Congress sent the following resolution to the President and Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania:

"Resolved, That the president and supreme executive council of Pennsylvania be informed, that the authority of the United States, having been this day grossly insulted by the disorderly and menacing appearance of a body of armed soldiers, about the place within which Congress were assembled, and the peace of this city being endangered by the mutinous disposition of the said troops, now in the barracks, it is, in the opinion of Congress, necessary that effectual measures be immediately taken for supporting the public authority.

"Resolved, That the committee on a letter from colonel Butler, be directed to confer, without loss of time with the supreme executive council of Pennsylvania, on the practicality of carrying the preceding resolution into effect: and that in case it shall appear to the committee, that there is not a satisfactory ground for expecting adequate and prompt exertions of this state, for supporting the dignity of the federal government, the president, on the advice of the committee, be authorized and directed to summon the members of the Congress to meet on Thursday next, at Trenton or Princeton, in New Jersey, in order that further and more effectual steps may be taken for suppressing the present revolt and maintaining the dignity and authority of the United States.

"Resolved, That the secretary at war be directed to communicate to the commander of said troops, in order that he may take immediate measures to dispatch to this city such forces as he may judge expedient, for suppressing any disturbances that may ensue."

In a conference between the committee and the council, the Congress again requested the protection of the State as they had done when they first heard of the impending march on Philadelphia. The committee indicated that they found the situation:

"Of so serious a nature as render palliatives improper and to require that vigorous measures should be taken to put a stop to the further progress of the evil, and to compel submission of the part of the offenders. * * * That though they had declined a specification of the measures which they would deem effectual, it was their sense that a number of the militia should be immediately called out sufficient to suppress the revolt."

The executive council again made it clear that the militia of Pennsylvania did not intend to come to the aid of the Congress. The council answered the request of the committee of the Congress by saying:

"That the council had a high respect for the representative sovereignty of the United States, and were disposed to do everything in their power to support its dignity. That they regretted the insult which had happened. * * * That they had consulted a number of well informed officers of the militia, and found that nothing in the present state of things was to be expected from that quarter. That the militia of the city in general were not only ill provided for service, but disinclined to act upon the present occasion. That the council did not believe any exertions were to be looked for from them except in a case of further outrage and actual violence to person or property."

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

The committee made several points in response to the council's decision. They said:

"That impunity for what had happened might encourage more flagrant proceedings, invite others to follow the example and extend the mischief . . . That Congress would probably continue to pursue this object unless it should be superceded by unequivocal demonstrations of submission on the part of the mutineers. . . . The Committee finding that there was not satisfactory ground to expect prompt and adequate exertions on the part of the executive of the state for supporting the public authority, were bound by the resolution under which they had acted to advise the president to summon Congress to assemble at Princeton or Trenton on Thursday the 26th instant."

The committee expressed its willingness to delay the departure of the Congress, "hoping that further information would produce more decisive measures on the part of the council" but, receiving no such indications from the council—

"The committee could no longer think themselves at liberty to delay their advice for an adjournment, which this day accordingly gave, persuaded at the same time it was necessary to impress the mutineers with a conviction that extremities would be used against them before they would be induced to resolve on a final unreserved submission."

Some of the reasoning behind the decision of Congress to leave Philadelphia was expressed in the local newspapers at the time. A few excerpts should serve to make the issue clear. A reporter for the Pennsylvania Packet said in a story dated June 28:

"Congress conceived the dignity of the union somewhat touched on by the appearance of an armed body not under command, and as measures were not so immediately entered on by the state for preventing it, as Congress conceived the dignity (not the danger) of the case required they adjourned their meeting to Princeton."¹⁰

In the July 5 issue of the Pennsylvania Packet, a reporter wrote on the implications of the mutiny:

"Suppose on the contrary, that mischief had happened, and that a scene of tumult had ensued, which it was in the power of the city to have prevented, had measures been concerted in time. . . . There is no provision made in the confederation for the residence and convenience of Congress. To whom, as a body, are delegated, and to whom are entrusted the greatest and most important concerns, which America, now sovereign and independent, has on her hands. . . .

The states individually appoint their delegates and send them to seek residence per leave, and to depend for the safety of their persons, and what is more, the safety of their national concerns on the will and pleasure of some individual state. A situation which will ever be attended with inconveniences. . . . Is this consistent with the honor or character of the states, either individually or collectively. Congress to whom so much is entrusted, ought not to depend upon so precarious a tenure . . . ought not . . . the representatives of that union be securely and commodiously placed, that the business of the continent may not,

by any local or accidental circumstance be interrupted."

Official notification of the adjournment of the Congress from Philadelphia to Princeton and the reasons for the change were given in a proclamation issued June 24, 1783, by Elias Boudinot, president of the Continental Congress.

"Whereas a body of armed soldiers in the service of the United States, and quartered in the barracks of this city, having mutinously renounced their obedience to their officers, did, on Saturday the twenty-first day of this instant, proceed, under the direction of their sergeants, in a hostile and threatening manner to the place in which Congress were assembled, and did surround the same with guards; and whereas Congress in consequence thereof, did on the same day resolve, 'That the president and supreme executive council of this state should be informed, that the authority of the United States, having been, that day, grossly insulted by the disorderly and menacing appearance of a body of armed soldiers, about the place within which Congress were assembled, and that the peace of this city being endangered by the mutinous disposition of the said troops then in the barracks; it was, in the opinion of Congress, necessary, that effectual measures should be immediately taken for supporting the public authority;' and also whereas Congress did at the same time appoint a committee to confer with the said president and supreme executive council on the practicality of carrying the said resolution into due effect; and also whereas the said committee have reported to me, that they have not received satisfactory reassurances for expecting adequate and prompt exertions of this state for supporting the dignity of the federal government; and also whereas the said soldiers still continue in a state of open mutiny and revolt so that the dignity and authority of the United States would be constantly exposed to a repetition of insult, while Congress shall continue to sit in this city. I do therefore, by and with the advice of said committee, according to the powers and authorities in me vested for this purpose, hereby summon the honorable delegates composing the Congress of the United States, and every of them, to meet in Congress on Thursday the twenty-sixth day of June, instant, at Princeton in the state of New Jersey, in order that further and more effectual measures may be taken for suppressing the present revolt, and maintaining the dignity and authority of the United States, of which all officers of the United States, civil and military, and all others whom it may concern, are desired to take notice and govern themselves accordingly."

Subsequently, a Constitutional Convention was called for the purpose of framing a Constitution for the United States. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America states that:

"The Congress shall have power. . . . To exercise exclusive Legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the state in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings."

¹⁰ The Pennsylvania Packet or the General Advertiser, July 5, 1783, p. 3.

¹¹ The Pennsylvania Packet or the General Advertiser, June 26, 1783, p. 2.

When searching for an explanation for the basic reasoning behind any particular section of the Constitution, historians invariably turn to the Federalist Papers. This work is, as its subtitle indicates:

"A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States, Being a Collection of Essays Written in Support of the Constitution agreed upon September 17, 1787 by the Federal Convention."

James Madison, in paper No. 43, explains article I, section 8 of the Constitution as follows:

"The indispensable necessity of complete authority at the seat of government, carries its own evidence with it. It is a power exercised by every legislature of the union, I might say of the world, by virtue of its general supremacy. Without it, not only the public authority might be insulted and its proceedings interrupted with impunity; but a dependence of the members of the general government on the State comprehending the seat of the government, for protection in the exercise of their duty, might bring on the national councils an imputation of awe or influence, equally dishonorable to the government and dissatisfactory to the other members of the Confederacy. This consideration has the more weight, as the gradual accumulation of public improvements at the stationary residence of the government would be both too great a public pledge to be left in the hands of a single State, and would create so many obstacles to a removal of the government, as still further to abridge its necessary independence. The extent of this federal district is sufficiently circumscribed to satisfy every jealousy of an opposite nature. And it is to be appropriated to this use with the consent of the State ceding it; as the state will no doubt provide in the compact for the rights of the citizens inhabiting it; as the inhabitants will find sufficient inducements of interest to become willing parties to the cession; as they will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them; and as the authority of the legislature of the State, and of the inhabitants of the ceded part of it, to concur in the cession, will be derived from the whole people of the State, in their adoption of the Constitution, every imaginable objection seems to be obviated."

Thus, it is clear beyond any doubt, that when making provisions for a Federal city as the seat of National Government, those who created our Constitution remembered the experience of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia and sought to prevent a recurrence of such a situation. As Madison said:

"Without 'complete authority at the seat of government . . . the public authority might be insulted and its proceedings interrupted with impunity.'"

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

¹² The Federalist Papers, No. 43.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 1-2.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 2.

¹² The Pennsylvania Packet or the General Advertiser, June 26, 1783, p. 3.